



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,562	12/12/2003	Uday T. Turaga		3923
7590	04/04/2006		EXAMINER	
RICHMOND, HITCHCOCK, FISH & DOLLAR			NGUYEN, TAM M	
P.O. Box 2443			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Bartlesville, OK 74005			1764	
DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/735,562	TURAGA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tam M. Nguyen	1764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extension of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-76 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-66, 75, and 76 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 67-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 67-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khare (6,274,533) in view of either Feimer et al. (6,579,444) or Khare et al. (6,150,300)

Art Unit: 1764

Khare'533 discloses a desulfurization process by contacting a hydrocarbon stream (e.g., diesel fuel) with an adsorbent comprising zinc oxide, silica, alumina, and a reduced valence promoter in a desulfurization zone to remove sulfur from the hydrocarbon stream to form a desulfurization hydrocarbon stream. The desulfurization stream is then separated from the spent adsorbent which is then regenerated and reduced before returning to the desulfurization zone. The desulfurization zone is operated at a temperature of from 100° F to 1000° F (37.8-537.8° C) and at a pressure of from 15 psia to 1500 psia. The reduction step with hydrogen is operated at a temperature of from 100° F to 1500° F (37.8 - 815.5° C) and at a pressure in the range of from 15 to 1500 psia. Khare'533 discloses that the spent adsorbent is stripped prior to pass to the regeneration zone. (See col. 4, lines 30-31, 51-54; col. 7, lines 30-67; and col. 9, lines 12-67)

Khare'533 does not disclose that the adsorbent comprises gallium.

Feimer discloses a desulfurization process by utilizing an adsorbent comprising gallium. (See abstract; col. 7, lines 57-59)

Khare'300 disclose that a desulfurization composition can comprise gallium. (See abstract; col. 3, line 40)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Khare'533 by having gallium in the adsorbent because Feimer teaches that at least a portion of aluminum can be replaced by gallium and Khare'300 teaches that aluminum oxide has an equivalent function as gallium oxide (see col. 3, lines 37 and 40). Therefore, it would be expected that the results would be the same or similar when using a catalyst comprising zinc oxide, alumina, silica, gallium, and a promoter or a catalyst comprising zinc oxide, alumina, silica, and a promoter.

Response to Arguments

The argument that the gallium component is used in addition to an aluminum-containing compound in the instant application and not as replacement for an aluminum component is not persuasive. Both Feimer and Khare'300 teach the obvious of incorporating gallium into the adsorbent of Khare'533. Whether gallium was initially added or added by replacing alumina, the modified catalyst of Khare'533 comprises gallium as claimed.

The argument that the Khare'533 and the instant application disclose processes for removal of sulfur, including organo sulfur compounds while Khare'300 is applicable for removal of hydrogen sulfide is not persuasive because the instant claimed process draws to a process to remove sulfur which is not necessary to be organo sulfur compounds.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1764

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tam M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Calderola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tam M. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 1764

TN

